

By



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/466,279      | 12/17/1999  | HAJIME INOUE         | SONYJP-3.0-0        | 9975             |

530 7590 08/25/2005

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK  
600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST  
WESTFIELD, NJ 07090

EXAMINER

BROWN, RUEBEN M

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2611

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/466,279

**Applicant(s)**

INOUE ET AL.

**Examiner**

Reuben M. Brown

**Art Unit**

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-11 and 13-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-11 and 13-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant argues on page 7, that the “unique node ID” of Fujimora is dynamic, which is different from the “node unique ID”. Applicant goes on to argue that the “node unique ID” is hardwired and therefore does not meet the required subject matter. Examiner agrees, that the “node unique ID” assigned by the manufacturer, but contends that the teachings of Fujimora still reads on the claimed features.

First of all, examiner points out that the claim merely recites that the “register... for allocating node ID number”. Claim 1 does not require that the register makes the initial allocation or assignment of the ID number. Thus even though the “node unique ID” is allocated or assigned to a device by the manufacturer, once installed at a terminal, the “node unique ID” is also allocated in the node information table by the NIM 9. Fujimora discloses that the node information table stores (i.e., allocates) the correspondence between the node IDs and the “node unique ID”, col. 24, lines 47-60.

Applicant specifically argues on page 8 that even though Fujimora maintains a 64 bit node unique ID, that since that value is defined in advance by a maker of a node device, that the value is not allocated as is claimed in claim 1. Again, as pointed out by examiner, the node

Art Unit: 2611

information table in Fujimora stores the correspondence between the node IDs and “node unique ID”, which reads on the claimed allocating.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-11, 13-18 & 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshino, (EP # 0 853 402 A), in view of Fujimora, (U.S. Pat # 5,825,752).

Considering amended claim1, the claimed receiving apparatus for receiving a digital broadcast which comprises a transport stream, such that the video and audio data have been compressed and multiplexed, comprising:

‘ a decoder for decoding the transport stream’ is met by the operation of the IRD 102, which receives video signals, and that includes video processing section 303, Yoshino, col. 4, lines 17-35.

‘digital interface for mutually transmitting the decoded transport stream to and from digital signal processing devices’ reads on the digital connection interface 304; col. 4, lines 21-25.

Art Unit: 2611

‘register for selecting predetermined number of devices from among a plurality of DSP devices connected to the digital interface for allocating node ID numbers to the selected devices, such that the register stores a record of the node ID number allocated to the selected device’ reads on col. 4, lines 38-47 & col. 5, lines 5-21.

As for the additionally claimed feature of the register maintaining the record of the node ID number regardless of whether the selected device remains connected to the digital interface, Yoshino does not teach such a feature. However, Fujimora teaches that when a plurality of devices are connected to a network, it is advantageous to provide a unique node ID, to each of the devices, which does not change during a bus reset; col. 9, lines 10-21. This unique node ID is in fact stored in a register, i.e., a node information table that maintains the correspondence between the unique node ID and a dynamic node ID; col. 24, lines 47-60.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Yoshino with the feature of maintaining a static node ID for devices connected to a network, at least for the benefit of insuring the uniqueness of each node, as taught by Fujimora, col. 24, lines 60-62.

Considering claims 3 & 13, as for confirming whether a node ID has been allocated, the claimed feature necessarily reads on the disclosure of Yoshino, which teaches that the ID numbers are determined in accordance with IEEE1394 standards, and that each devices is

Art Unit: 2611

determined to have its own (i.e., unique) node ID number, col. 5, lines 10-18. Also, Fujimora discloses the use of a unique node ID.

Considering claims 4 & 14, the amended claimed subject matter is broad enough to read on all of the devices being reconnected, after a bus reset and is met by the “node unique ID”, in Fujimora which does not change after bus reset.

Considering claims 5 & 15, Yoshino teaches that records stored in the register may be changed by user input, col. 8, lines 10-25, and discusses user selection of a source and/or target device, col. 8, lines 26-55.

Considering claims 6 & 16, the claimed subject matter reads on the discussion in Fujimora that the unique node ID are not deleted upon bus reset.

Considering claims 7 & 17, Yoshino teaches displaying the list of connected devices; see Fig. 8 & Fig. 15; col. 8, lines 10-25 & col. 13, lines 11-30.

Considering claims 8 & 18, see Yoshino Fig. 8 & Fig. 15, which teaches that disconnected devices have a different appearance from connected devices.

Considering claims 10 & 20, the user in Yoshino is enabled to select a target or source device, col. 13, lines 10-30.

Art Unit: 2611

4. Claims 9 & 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshino & Fujimora, in view of Horlander, (U.S. Pat # 6,507,953).

Considering claims 9 & 19, Yoshino, which includes recording devices, does not teach providing a warning when a record of a device to provide recording has been changed.

Nevertheless, Horlander, which is in the same field of endeavor provides such a feature, col. 4, lines 12-26; col. 7, lines 66-67 & col. 7- col. 8, line 14. Horlander provides resolution when it detects that a VCR is not on the bus. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Yoshino with the teachings of Horlander, at least for the advantage of notifying the user that a pending recording would not be made, since the recording device is not connected.

#### ***Conclusion***

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2611

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**or faxed to:**

(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

**Or:**

(571) 273-7290 (for informal or draft communications, please label  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Reuben M. Brown whose telephone number is (571) 272-7290. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00-6:00), First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Grant can be reached on (571) 272-7294. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Reuben M. Brown

  
**HAITRAN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**